

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent 6,256,013 (hereinafter "Siddiqui"), in view of U.S. Patent 5,956,018 (hereinafter "Pejic").

Claim 1 includes a limitation of a top member forming an integral housing and button. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is well known in the art by referring to page 6 of the Applicant's Specification. However, page 6 of the Specification refers to Figure 2, which is not admitted prior art. Figure 2 illustrates an embodiment of the invention. The portion specifically cited by the Examiner explains only that *a conventional computer mouse has a separate button*, and that the all-in-one top housing and button eliminates the need for the conventional separate button. Therefore, the Examiner has not shown a top member forming an integral housing and button. As a result, not all of the limitations of claim 1 are found in Siddiqui and Pejic, and claim 1 is patentable over Siddiqui and Pejic.

Claim 9 includes a limitation of a button being a top housing of a computer mouse. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is admitted by the Applicants to be well known in the art. However, as noted above, the cited portion of the specification refers to a conventional computer mouse having a separate button. Therefore, this limitation is not admitted by the Applicants to be prior art. Siddiqui teaches that a mouse case top 200 includes two separate

buttons 204 and 206 (Col. 5, lines 33-36, see also Figure 3). Pejic teaches several separate buttons 20 mounted within a case (Col. 4, lines 29-34). Therefore, not all of the limitations of claim 9 are found in Siddiqui and Pejic, and claim 9 is patentable over Siddiqui and Pejic.

Claim 14 includes a limitation of a depressable housing coupled to a base. The Examiner asserts that this limitation is admitted by the Applicants to be well known in the art. As noted above, the cited portion of the specification refers to a conventional computer mouse having a separate button. Therefore, this limitation is not admitted by the Applicants to be prior art. Siddiqui teaches a case top 200 and case bottom 300 fixed together to form a housing 114 (Col. 3, lines 48-50, Col. 6, lines 49-59, see also Figures 1 and 2). Pejic teaches a device having a unitary body or case 12, and does not show the body or case 12 being separable (Col. 4, lines 16-20). Therefore, not all of the limitations of claim 14 are found in Siddiqui and Pejic, and claim 14 is patentable over Siddiqui and Pejic.

Dependent claims 2-8, 10-13, and 15-20 depend from the above discussed independent claims. Therefore, claims 2-8, 10-13, and 15-20 include all the limitations of the independent claims. Since the independent claims are patentable over Siddiqui and Pejic, claims 2-8, 10-13 and 15-20 are also patentable over Siddiqui and Pejic.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen M. Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: July 28, 2003



Arlen M. Hartounian  
Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300